

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY  
REPORT ON PATENTABILITY  
(SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/008841

**Re Item II**

**10/568118**

The International Searching Authority has not been able to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed was not available at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: XP686013 "Definition of a global Wake on Local Area Network Frame" by IBM

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-9 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

- 2.01 The subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step as D1 discloses:  
*A method ... a plurality of connected nodes (D1, page 42, lines 33-41, "all ... enabled clients") comprising initiating a ... request at a first node (D1, page 41, lines 33-34, "Network Manager"); sending a packet from said first node (D1, page 41, lines 33-34, "Network Manager") to a second node (D1, page 42, lines 20-25, "a system with MAC address 2F 00 80 87 69 ED") wherein said packet is recognised by said second node as a ... command (D1, page 42, lines 20-25, "the controller would ... compare ..."),*

The method of claim 1 differs from D1 in that claim 1 defines *a method of resetting; and said second node resets itself* whereas D1 discloses method of waking-up (D1, page 42, lines 33-41, "Wake-up") and awakening nodes (D1, page 42, lines 20-25, "a system with MAC address 2F 00 80 87 69 ED would then wake up"). A reset brings a node from an active state in a default state whereas a wake-up brings a node from standing by mode in a default state. The wake-up and the reset are technically

closely related procedures. However the difference is that in the method of claim 1 the node is in an active state whereas in the method of D1 the node is a stand by state. Hence the effect of said difference is that with the method of claim 1 a node in an active state can be brought in a default state. The problem to be solved is how to bring an active node in a default state. This problem is well-known and the person skilled in the art would adapt the method of D1 using a reset command instead of a wake-up call and arrive at the method of claim 1 without the need of an inventive step.

2.02 The subject-matter of claims 2-3 is not inventive in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT as D1 further discloses:

*wherein said reset request packet is send serially and sequentially to further nodes (D1, page 42, lines 29-31, "Token Ring" & lines 33-34, "ability to wake up all ... clients with just one packet")*

*wherein said nodes are arranged in a ring (D1, page 42, lines 29-31, "Token Ring").*

2.03 The subject-matter of claim 9 does not involve an inventive step as the objections made to claim 1 apply mutatis mutandis to corresponding system claim 1.

2.04 The subject-matter of claim 4 further differs from D1 in that claim 4 defines *decrementing a register* each time the packet passes a node. However this additional subject-matter is not inventive since it does not solve any problem as the register is never tested. Even if the steps of testing the register and discarding the packet, where added to the method of claim 4 to implement a Time To Live (TTL)(see description, page 3 lines 1-13), the subject-matter of the amended method of claim 4 would not involve an inventive step. Implementing TTL in protocols is well-practised. For example, in the Internet Protocol, TTL is an 8 bit field that indicates how many more hops a packet should be allowed to make before it is discarded. Its the 9th octet of 20 in the IP header.

2.05 Dependent claims 5-8 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step in the sense of Article 33(2&3) PCT since *a time delay to be able to forward the packet before resetting* is an obvious

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY  
REPORT ON PATENTABILITY  
(SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/008841

consequence of the method since a node would not be able to pass the token to the next client during resetting or the token may be lost,  
*using a standard interface* as in claim 6 is disclosed (D1, page 41, lines 3-12, "administration console")  
and the features *converting a manager request* or *converting a debug command* defined in claims 7 and 8 are a juxtaposition of features. The method begins with the initiation of a request. To base the initiation on a particular event is a straight forward choice between alternatives, obvious to the person skilled in the art.

M.P.Dieben  
1st Examiner